

REMARKS

I. AMENDMENTS

In response to the Decision on Appeal dated September 21, 2010, claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended. Claims 1-24 remain in the application. Re-consideration of the application is requested.

II. RATIONALE FOR AMENDMENTS IN VIEW OF DECISION ON APPEAL

The Decision on Appeal affirmed the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Srinivasan (2004/0205734)(“Srinivasan”) and Microsoft Corp, Platfrom SDK: COM IGlobalInterfaceTable (2001)(“IGlobalInterfaceTable”).

Applicants note that throughout the Decision, the Board indicated that the claim language did not require that the secondary application be unaware of the disconnected application (see pages 8 and 13-14). Further, it appears from the Decision on Appeal and prior Actions that the context for operating the present invention is unclear in the present claims. As a result, Applicants have amended the claims to further clarify the context of the application and to clearly indicate that both the secondary application and disconnected application are unaware of each other.

Further, the amended claims now provide a timing component regarding when the bridge object is created (i.e., at the time when the document that hosts the disconnected application is created).

In addition, the amended claims now provide that the use of the interface as claimed enables the disconnected application to be isolated from specifics of how communication with the secondary application is accomplished.

Lastly, the amended claims provide that the cookie is stored in a location that is accessible to both the disconnected application and the secondary application.

Such amendments are fully consistent with the indications and language/recommendations set forth in the Decision on Appeal. Further, Applicants submit that such amendments serve to clearly distinguish both Srinivasan and IGlobalInterfaceTable from the present invention (either alone or in combination). More specifically, as previously submitted, Srinivasan requires awareness by the COM client of the calculator (e.g., Srinivasan

paragraph [0007] requires the COM client to be looking for a specific control – the calculator through a Jini brokering service. In this regard, Srinivasan requires the COM client to maintain a knowledge base of the GUIDs (globally unique identifier) and the COM client searches for the calculator by specifying a GUID corresponding to the calculator on behalf of a client. The Jini broker finds the desired ActiveX component and returns Java objects. Thus, Srinivasan's COM client is clearly aware of the calculator. Such an awareness is in direct contrast with the present claims which requires that both the disconnected application and the secondary application are unaware of each other.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 7, and 13 are allowable over IGlobalInterfaceTable, Srinivasan, and Tock. Further, dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 are submitted to be allowable over the cited references in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 recite additional novel elements not shown by the cited references.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
Kenneth A. Vadella et al.
By their attorneys,

GATES & COOPER LLP

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: November 22, 2010

By: Jason S. Feldmar
Name: Jason S. Feldmar
Reg. No.: 39,187